



# AD HOC WORK GROUP

## HENRY HAGG LAKE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

### Meeting No. 4 Summary *Meeting Date: June 12, 2003 (Final Meeting)*

#### I. Meeting Attendees

##### AHWG Members:

\*denotes attendance at AHWG meeting number 4

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ric Balfor, PUMP</li> <li>• Paul Bilick, Coast Guard</li> <li>• *Dick Caldwell, ODFW</li> <li>• *George Dallas, Local Resident</li> <li>• *Herb Doumitt, OR Bass and Panfish Club</li> <li>• Andy Dyuck, WACO Board of Commissioners</li> <li>• Scott Diamond, OR Road Runners Club</li> <li>• Warren Hobson, Marine Patrol</li> <li>• *Chuck Kingston, Joint Water Commission</li> <li>• Kathi Larson, USFWS</li> <li>• *Gary Myers, NW Outdoor Science School</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jim Olson, Mazamas (hiking/birding)</li> <li>• *Wally Otto, TVID</li> <li>• Mark Sytsma, Center for Lakes and Reservoirs, PSU</li> <li>• *Steve Seeley, WACO Parks and Recreation</li> <li>• *Wayne Shuyler, OSMB</li> <li>• Josh Smith, Gaston Fire Department</li> <li>• *Don Vandebergh, ODFW</li> <li>• *Tom VanderPlaat, Clean Water Services</li> <li>• *Chris Wayland, WACO Parks Supervisor</li> <li>• Tom Wolf, Trout Unlimited</li> <li>• *Ray Wold, Oregon Equestrian Trails</li> </ul>
---	---

##### Planning Team

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• *Carolyn Burpee Stone, Team Leader, Reclamation</li> <li>• Jeff Reavis, Realty, Reclamation</li> <li>• Patti Llewellyn, Program Manager, Reclamation</li> <li>• Karen Blakney, Reclamation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• *Kevin Butterbaugh, EDAW</li> <li>• *Jim Keany, EDAW</li> <li>• *Peter Carr, EDAW</li> <li>• John Petrovsky, JPA</li> <li>• *Tanya Sommer, Reclamation</li> </ul>
--	--

##### Other Participants

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• *Larry Eisenberg, WACO</li> </ul>
--

## **II. Introduction (Kevin Butterbaugh)**

Kevin Butterbaugh (EDAW) began the evening's meeting by explaining the absence of much of the Planning Team, primarily due to airplane malfunctions in the Boise area. At the start of the meeting, the Planning Team members consisted of EDAW team members; Carolyn Burpee-Stone (Reclamation) arrived later in the evening. The main purpose of tonight's meeting is to hear AHWG comments on the Draft EA and Preferred Alternative; these comments will be used to further shape and refine the Preferred Alternative based on stakeholder review and feedback. Other agenda items for tonight include describing the RMP implementation process, and reviewing what the Planning Team has accomplished since the last AHWG meeting (September 2002). Note: there were no comments or requested changes to the last meeting summary.

Since the last AHWG meeting, the Planning Team has focused on incorporating Work Group and Planning Team comments and preferences into the reshaped Preferred Alternative, preparing and releasing the Draft EA, publishing Newsbrief #3, and hosting the Public Meeting/Workshop (which was held May 22 in Hillsboro, OR).

At this point in the meeting, a discussion ensued regarding the issues of: (1) the camping-related proposal presented as part of the Preferred Alternative; and (2) feedback on the AHWG process – specifically, how AHWG concerns raised at the previous meetings were integrated into the alternatives development process. These topics became the themes that echoed over the course of the evening, with specific information presented below. In summary, several members expressed their frustration over camping being included as part of the Preferred Alternative; their impression was that, based on previous AHWG dialog, it was clear that the majority of the Group strongly opposed camping at Henry Hagg Lake (as stated in the AHWG Meeting #3 summary). Therefore, it came as an unpleasant surprise to some to see the Draft EA present camping as a component of the Preferred Alternative. It was the opinion of some that this outcome undermined the faith of some individuals in the RMP public involvement process.

## **III. Summary of Public Comments on the Draft EA (Jim Keany)**

Jim Keany (EDAW) summarized the public comments received to date on the Draft EA, noting that the official comment period does not end until June 20; therefore, additional comments are expected. As of June 12, however, Reclamation has only received comments from two individuals. The first respondent commented on the general issue of water quality, specifically regarding septic systems. In his e-mail comment, he recommended that the long-term effects of using septic systems for sewage disposal be examined; a better potential solution would be to use vault toilets or a sewer system.

The other response letter was received from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The agency identified the following priority items as part of the RMP: (1) development of an elk management plan; (2) overall implementation of wildlife and vegetation management actions (as identified under the Preferred Alternative); (3) implementation of erosion and sedimentation controls for water quality; (4) the agency would prefer to retain Recreation Area A East as a day use only area, but recognizing the County's identified need for camping, the USFWS would prefer to see a phased development approach so impacts can be monitored; and (5) the agency would prefer to see the site identified for the Environmental Education Center maintained as elk meadow, but if the center is built it would be better if it were developed at a later phase of RMP implementation (and it would require mitigation lands for the loss of elk meadow habitat).

Jim also noted that unofficial public comments were received at the recent Public Meeting/Workshop. About eight people attended the meeting, and unofficial verbal comments included complaints about current personal watercraft (PWC) use on the reservoir, as well as future concerns about campground-related noise (especially RV generators).

Jim concluded this part of the agenda by encouraging AHWG members to submit their comments in writing by the close of the official comment period (June 20).

#### **IV. AHWG Comments on the Draft EA (Group)**

##### **Introduction and General Comments**

The main reason for this evening's meeting is to give AHWG members an opportunity to share their specific concerns and perspectives on the Draft EA and the Preferred Alternative. Before opening the floor to each member, however, a short general discussion/Q&A period occurred. This discussion is summarized below, followed by individual Work Group member feedback.

Several members noted that the Preferred Alternative as presented in the Draft EA differed substantially from their expectations (particularly in regard to camping at Recreation Area A East), in comparison to the lengthy discussion on this topic at the September 2002 AHWG meeting. Overall, the actions associated with camping at the reservoir don't seem to reflect the AHWG preferences. Herb Doumitt said he was shocked to see the camping-related action items, saying "I read the EA and I thought 'I don't know if I've been to any of these AHWG meetings.'" Another member characterized the recreation development proposals as an aggressive approach to providing opportunities for recreation use of the area (especially related to No Action). People noted that this issue raised questions about both the advocacy of camping at the reservoir, as well as questions about the RMP process and how AHWG preferences were incorporated. As noted above, discussion of this particular issue occurred throughout the evening.

Kevin stressed that the development of the Preferred Alternative was a conscious effort on the Planning Team's part to reach some sort of middle ground on the camping issue. Clearly, some stakeholders favor and advocate camping at the reservoir, whereas others are opposed. The camping components of the Preferred Alternative are scaled back in relation to some people's site preferences, and the phased approach was deliberately designed to monitor and examine effects of less impact camping (tent-only) prior to opening up the area for RV use (if at all). In particular, the Preferred Alternative's approach to camping is less intensive than the No Action Alternative (i.e., implementation of recommendations of the 1994 WACO master plan). Kevin also stressed that, as clearly presented at the initial AHWG meetings, the AHWG input process is one of "informed consent," not pure consensus-building. In that vein, the perceived "voting" exercise of the previous AHWG meeting was not to be construed as an actual vote on elements of the Preferred Alternative; rather, it was intended to gauge support or preferences. Kevin also noted that Reclamation had informed the group from the beginning that they reserved the right as the final decision-makers, but with an open ear to public/agency comments. Chris Wayland also stressed that any such development would be contingent on approval and funding. Tom VanderPlaat commented that any proposals presented in the RMP, however, would create certain expectations for levels of development, which would be used by future planners and decision-makers; that is, even if the facilities were not built due to inundation, there would be pressure to provide them elsewhere if they were proposed in the RMP. He noted that this would certainly be an expectation related to the Water Feasibility Study (dam raise) – i.e., that that project mitigate for any lost recreational opportunities, including those not yet built but contained in the RMP.

It was discussed that one of the elements of the “surprise” might have been the 9-month gap between AHWG meetings; much has occurred since September. Later in the meeting, Carolyn noted that she had sent out a letter to AHWG members (dated March 26, 2003) summarizing elements of the Preferred Alternative, asking for additional input, but perhaps an additional meeting would have been helpful and appropriate.

As a related issue, Gary Myers expressed concern about developing recreation facilities that might need to be rebuilt/relocated if the dam raise project proceeds.

## **Specific Comments**

### Chris Wayland, WACO

No comment; I’ve had plenty of opportunity for input into throughout this process, and the RMP reflects my concerns.

### Dick Caldwell, ODFW

I’m uncomfortable with the proposed cofferdam across Tanner Creek, particularly related to fish entrapment and effects on cutthroat. Under Alternative C, I’m uncomfortable with the shoreline boardwalks and floating restrooms – predatory fish can hide under these structures and attack fingerling trout. Enhancement opportunities are listed for Scoggins and Tanner Creeks, but I don’t see anything at Sain Creek (which should be explored). Habitat enhancement could occur within the reservoir as well (structure, lake habitat) – I didn’t see this in the EA. Finally, I have general comment about revegetation/riparian enhancement activities – I’d like to see “using native vegetation” specifically called out.

- Opposes cofferdam
- Concerned about boardwalks and floating restrooms (fish concerns)
- Habitat enhancement at Sain Creek and in the reservoir
- Use native vegetation

### Chuck Kingston, Joint Water Commission

I also feel like I wasn’t present at the last meeting. I got the impression that there was overwhelming opposition to camping in this area. It was clear that the No. 1 concern of most AHWG members was water quality, and I don’t see this as clearly reflected as possible. I was flabbergasted looking at the Preferred Alternative – it encompasses a far more aggressive recreation plan than anything that most in this group advocated.

My comments/perspective are tied to my job/position. From a water quality standpoint, I would not want to see camping. In general, the RMP represents a far too aggressive plan for recreation use. I’d also like to see other water quality related issues more clearly identified and addressed in the plan, such as zebra mussels, homeland security, mitten crabs, etc.

- Oppose camping (for water quality reasons)
- Frustrated with AHWG process
- Elevate other water quality issues

### Ray Wold, Oregon Equestrian Trails

We need camping facilities in the region, but I don't understand the plan to create a campground and dig it up in 5 years because of inundation. Stimson Lumber recently acquired lands nearby that would be excellent riding areas, and we could park our horse trailers on the land planned for the campground. Reclamation should coordinate with Stimson to see if these lands could be used by horses, hikers, bikers, hunters, etc.

- Need camping opportunities
- Coordinate with Stimson lumber regarding nearby lands

### Wayne Shuyler, OSMB

My focus is boating, but I'd say that the County needs to operate and manage resources at the reservoir, and camping would be a good source of revenue. Regarding boating, we'd support all of the elements of the Preferred Alternative, and we have money to help implement from sources such as the Clean Vessel Act; boating enhancements could be funded (e.g., floating restrooms as a water quality enhancement measure).

- Support (and fund) boating enhancements
- Camping would be excellent revenue source

### Don Vandebergh, ODFW

I need a bit more time to review the document before I provide specific comments. In general, though I'd like to address the elk meadows issue. I don't know where the statement in the Draft EA about monitoring over the next 10 years came from. The meadows are mitigation for the dam, and they need to be there. Monitoring data could be used to evaluate effectiveness of mitigation, not whether they should be in existence. Regarding bird/bat boxes – this is a “feel good” measure unless lots of management and maintenance are followed through; otherwise, the money is misspent (and starlings invade the boxes). Regarding eagle perch sites – we need to look at future perch sites, not just existing. Regarding camping – if camping did occur, I have a lot of comments about how to educate the public on wildlife/human conflicts (to minimize garbage, etc.) – I don't see anything about public education in the plan. Also, other options/opportunities exist in Washington County for camping facilities, although Henry Hagg Lake would be the only water-related camping opportunity.

- Elk meadows are mitigation requirement
- Cautions against bird/bat box program
- Educate public about wildlife and habitat issues
- Camping opportunities exist elsewhere in the county

### Steve Seeley, WACO Parks Advisory Board

Overnight camping would be a favorable thing. It would provide a tremendous source of revenue, and there's a real need for camping in Washington County. Also on our priority list would be improving recreation facilities, especially for the boat ramps.

- Favors camping – there's a need, and it would be revenue source
- Supports recreation facility improvements

### Herb Doumitt, OR Bass and Panfish Club

(See the above comments and discussion about camping and the overall RMP stakeholder process.) We're concerned about water quality, especially as pressure on the reservoir increases because of growing recreational use. I'd say that the risks associated with installing the cofferdams are too high. We want to work with Wally (Otto) to stabilize shorelines and minimize erosion to protect water quality; we've got resources/volunteers who are anxious to get going, and there are no plans on the table this year. Proven erosion control practices include anchoring trees; tire fencelines (or juniper) to reduce wave action on shoreline; plant native willows; etc. The goal is to mimic natural systems to reduce shoreline erosion from wave action. Our volunteers are anxious to help – the highest costs with these types of projects are labor, and we've got a free source of volunteer labor. At the upper end of the reservoir, we'd recommend living structures, such as willows. Apart from these erosion-related issues, I'd like to stress that we oppose camping, and we oppose the cofferdams.

Herb's erosion prevention comments stimulated a fair amount of dialog about the benefits and drawbacks of specific actions and measures. Dick Caldwell referenced an NRCS manual addressing bank stabilization, which should be consulted. Wally noted that there hasn't been any large debris in the reservoir this year suitable for such projects. He also said that anchoring material has a host of associated problems and that items placed tend to move. Chris noted that there is a related child safety issue with such structures, such as kids climbing on rolling logs. Herb stressed that these are merely examples of methods and opportunities to improve water quality; if there are reasons not to implement specific measures, you use different measures. We'd rely on guidance from experts. He also referenced various regional success stories (e.g., Prineville, Brownlee, Snake River).

There was also a discussion theme that camping is being proposed as a funding measure (that is, funding for other park-related needs such as habitat enhancement). If funding was a consideration or need, we should have looked at other potential funding options (such as use fees, trash fees, etc.). The current approach is a back door method.

- Opposes camping
- Frustrated with AHWG process – not a legitimate public process
- Recommends erosion control measures (using volunteer labor)
- Explore funding options other than camping

### Gary Myers, Northwest Outdoor Science School

Overall, we're interested in minimal development around the reservoir. The Center would employ environmentally sustainable methods to minimize impacts. It would provide access opportunities for large numbers of people to learn about and appreciate the resources that are there, with minimal impact to these resources. Our uses would be well managed and structured to educate and prevent impacts, and the subsequent behavior of our participants will benefit the sites. In some cases, we can help with these actions, such as elk meadow mitigation. I'd recommend the point by Area A East (which is currently overrun by Scot's broom and blackberries) as an ideal elk mitigation site; our participants could help clear these areas as mitigation lands. Our Program (i.e., the Research Center) could help with such aspects as physical monitoring/surveying; bird box/bat box maintenance and installation; etc. The entire park could be an interpretive center, with kiosks and signs. As proposed, the phased construction of the Center is most feasible.

The Preferred Alternative proposes an aggressive development plan overall, which would encourage increasing use. Eventually we'll have a carrying capacity issue at the reservoir. I would recommend having less recreational development around the reservoir. Actions such as doubling the parking lots, introducing camping, and putting in concession stands might not be the right direction.

Specifically, any work on parking structures/roads might include permeable structures rather than blacktop; incorporate environmentally sustainable practices, such as bioswales. There are many new technologies that look like pavement that are actually permeable.

- Advocates Center for environmental education
- Recommends point by Area A East as elk mitigation site
- Supports less development around the reservoir – need to examine carrying capacity
- Use permeable surface for most parking areas and roads

#### Tom VanderPlatt, Clean Water Services

We need to maintain water quantity; we never want to have polluted water – that is the highest priority, and it applies to the entire watershed. Also, we need to make sure that RMP actions don't impede storage contractors from getting their water (cofferdam construction should be evaluated against this criterion). Regarding the floating restroom, I'm not sure if it would be a benefit (as it would eliminate point source pollution) or not (as it would be a new facility, which I would generally oppose). [Chris Wayland commented that it would be a clear benefit]. Regarding camping, it's too bad the neighbors aren't at tonight's AHWG meeting to voice their opinion. [Note: George Dallas arrived later in the evening.]

The overall issue of carrying capacity should better be examined. Is allowing a million recreation visitor days truly a good thing for the reservoir? There's a point where it crosses the line, where too many people are present and love the resource to death.

- Water quality
- Guarantee contractor access
- Floating restroom
- Carrying capacity

#### Wally Otto, TVID

Security is a prime issue for the operators of Scoggins Dam. Our security measures range across a wide spectrum, encompassing recommendations from the Department of Homeland Security (e.g., alert levels); police protection in the Park; speeding on the reservoir; floating debris/garbage at the park; etc.

I'd also like to reiterate the sense of being shocked at the composition of Preferred Alternative. In the last meeting summary, it states "most group members present appear to strongly oppose camping for such reasons as...." And yet the Preferred Alternative promotes camping. Is this process futile? I'm not opposed to recreation use or camping per se, but it is important to determine how much use is enough; this especially pertains to water quality issues. The purpose of initial dam construction must be considered – to supply clean, raw water to irrigators, for cities, and to clean up the Tualatin River. It was not built to generate power or provide recreation opportunities. Overall, the dam (and its users) needs to be protected for safe operation and maintenance. Things are different now than they were 10 years ago, and we need to ensure that

dam is not damaged (e.g., by things such as the recent off season oil slick, the source of which remains unknown). The dam structure needs to be protected.

I appreciate people's (e.g., Gary) offers to monitor local wildlife; we have many people providing data on the elk herd, bald eagles, etc. I also liked Ray's idea of talking to Stimson about access on their lands.

- Security is the prime issue
- Frustrated with AHWG process
- Consider original project purpose

## **V. Summary of Potential Changes to the Preferred Alternative (Kevin)**

Summing up, Kevin noted that the composition of the Preferred Alternative might change in response to AHWG (and other public) comments on the Draft EA. As the public comment period is still open and we're expecting more letters, we can't say tonight what direction those changes might be. But based on AHWG comments tonight, two issues are clearly floating to the surface: (1) camping, and (2) surprise at the process. As at all previous AHWG meetings, water quality was obviously of paramount concern. At this time, we can't say how the input will change the Preferred Alternative, but the Planning Team will be considering this feedback.

In response to the frustration expressed tonight, we should talk a bit about the overall process. It's clear that some folks feel that their input was not integrated into the shaping of the Draft EA and the Preferred Alternative. There appears to be a disconnect between the September (2002) AHWG meeting and the outcome, with the camping proposal as the key example. This tells us that perhaps we could have done a better job with feedback to the AHWG more clearly documenting our direction. Again, Carolyn later pointed out that Reclamation did send out a letter (in March 2003) to the entire AHWG that described how their input was being used and what direction the Preferred Alternatives was taking, particularly related to camping, Elk Management Plan, and equestrian trails.

[BREAK]

## **VI. RMP Implementation Program and Identifying Priorities (Kevin)**

Kevin passed around a series of handout samples to show what the actual RMP will look like, how it will be structured, specifically in terms of implementing management actions. The RMP is the culmination of the process and will be the working management plan for the next 10 years. Although it's a public document, it differs from the EA and is designed specifically for the managers' use. Three handouts were developed to summarize the overall process, to show what management actions look like (and how they are presented), and to show how the Implementation Program will be structured. In particular, one of the handouts presented an example of the RMP summary table that lists management actions, priorities, related actions, timing/sequencing, responsible agencies, funding, and monitoring needs. Kevin also emphasized that it would be very helpful for the AHWG to submit detailed comments on specific issues that would feed into the development of management actions (as opposed to general concerns such as "improve water quality"); now is the right time to get final input into the process, and this will help shape the management actions. Two specific issues were raised by AHWG members: (1) the possible presence of western pond turtles in the reservoir area, and (2) the need to retrofit existing facilities with stormwater management components.

The next part of the meeting again sought member-specific AHWG input, this time focusing on priorities that each member would like to see identified in the RMP. Identifying priorities obviously affects the sequencing of individual management actions and the overall emphasis of the RMP, especially as this is a long-term plan.

George Dallas, Local Resident

1. Minimize development, especially camping. This should come last. Local residents don't want to see camping implemented at the reservoir.
2. Preserve water quality.
3. For safety reasons, add more buoys to separate the no wake zone from the fast area (I don't see this in the EA) [Chris notes that the OSMB and sheriff think it's adequate as is].
4. Non-motorized boat launch.
5. Elk and eagle habitat.
6. Maintain law enforcement commensurate with public use.

Wally Otto, TVID

1. Water quality and erosion control.
2. Enforcement, dependent on time of year (commensurate with use); for example, we need a marine patrol prior to Memorial Day (but in general focus on land-based enforcement).
3. Wildlife and vegetation management, including noxious weed control.
4. Finalize the elk meadow issue; we shouldn't be losing space for elk.
5. Safety/emergency services – they need to be properly funded and available.

Tom VanderPlatt, Clean Water Services

1. Water quality and erosion/sedimentation control – recommend retrofitting for stormwater control existing facilities (new management action recommended). Carrying capacity should also be determined to better understand effects of recreation use on water quality.
2. Enforcement (commensurate w/levels of public use).
3. Fisheries management.

Gary Myers, NW Outdoor Science School

General comment: if the EA proposes recreation development, a carrying capacity is essential (and it's missing from the analysis).

High priority items include (in no particular order):

- Water quality and wildlife enhancement opportunities (elk management plan, eagle monitoring plan, determining carrying capacity of reservoir and land).
- Developing the master trail; make sure it's built correctly so that runoff isn't an issue.
- Allowing/approving development of the Education Center.

Low priority items include:

- Camping.
- New recreation facilities that encourage additional use (restrooms, play areas, parking).

Herb Doumitt, OR Bass and Panfish Club

High priority items include:

- Plant woody species in riparian zones.
- Fish management – cooperate with ODFW on habitat enhancement projects.
- Add a floating restroom (out of shotgun range).

- Self-adjusting pier (at both ramps).
- Fish-cleaning stations (at boat ramps).

Low priority (i.e., we are opposed to):

- Cofferdam at Tanner Creek.
- Camping.

#### Steve Seeley, WACO Parks and Recreation

High priority items include:

- Recreation development (recreation areas, boat ramps, picnic areas, trails).
- Overnight camping.
- Water quality and erosion control.
- Fisheries management; wildlife and habitat management.

#### Don Vandebergh, ODFW

Note: I reserve the right to change these on our written comments (to be submitted later).

1. Protection of both state and federal wildlife species, and improvement/protection of their habitat.
2. Development of long-term elk management plan.
3. Overall wildlife and vegetation management, focusing on native species planting.
4. Water quality, erosion/sedimentation control.
5. Development of interpretive programs (wildlife, pre-history, history).
6. Assessing overall carrying capacity of the facilities.

#### Wayne Shuyler, OSMB

In order of priority:

1. Floating restroom.
2. Ramp C improvements (suggest adding a porta-potty dump).
3. Area A West boating facilities (restroom, parking, support, ramp/floats).
4. Recreation Area A East improvements.

#### Ray Wold, OR Equestrian Trails

In order of priority:

1. Water quality
2. Trails
3. Camping

#### Chuck Kingston, Joint Water Commission

In order of priority:

1. Water quality and erosion control; obtain revenue from a boat cleaning facility rather than a camping facility.
2. Review of the public access and carrying capacity of the reservoir.
3. All items of wildlife and fish management/enhancement (including elk meadows).

#### Dick Caldwell, ODFW

High priority items include:

- Maintain public access for people to fish.
- Revegetate in disturbed areas.
- Stream/enhancement opportunities.
- No Tanner Creek cofferdams.

- Water quality/erosion control.
- Noxious weed control.

Chris Wayland, WACO Parks Supervisor

In order of priority:

1. Developing some sort of limited access control (fees) for management.
2. Changing out the dock system (self-adjusting dock/float system).
3. Development of Scoggins Creek picnic area (under the Preferred Alternative).
4. Completion of the master trail and connecting pathways (hiking/biking).
5. Water quality and erosion control.

## **VII. Wrap-Up/Next Steps (Kevin, Carolyn Burpee-Stone)**

Kevin noted that there is one additional Planning Team meeting, scheduled for July 10. That will allow us 2 or 3 weeks to analyze and digest public and AHWG comments on the EA and the Preferred Alternative. We will be discussing how to incorporate those into the Final EA, scheduled for release in mid-December. The RMP will follow shortly after that (January). We will prepare a final Newsbrief about that time to wrap things up and announce the publishing of the Final EA and RMP.

Carolyn then expressed Reclamation's and the Planning Team's appreciation and thanks for AHWG participation. Reclamation and the County obviously can't produce a successful management plan in a vacuum, without stakeholder input and support. Such a plan would merely sit on the shelf. This input is invaluable in helping us develop a workable, implementable plan. Carolyn then passed out framed photographs (with a Margaret Mead quote) as a token of appreciation.

*[Adjourn]*